DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 721 FL 024 652

AUTHOR Williams, Gwendolyn M.
TITLE Challenging the Political Mirage of ESL and Bilingual Education: A Study of Public Knowledge.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 47p.; M.A. Paper, Pennsylvania State University. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (31st, Orlando, FL, March 11-15, 1997).
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses (040) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Bilingual Education Programs; *Bilingualism; Educational Strategies; *English (Second Language); Higher Education; Information Sources; Knowledge Level; *Politics of Education; Program Design; *Public Opinion; Second Language Instruction; Surveys; Teaching Methods; Transitional Programs

ABSTRACT

A survey investigating public beliefs about teaching methods of English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) and bilingual education is reported. An introductory section chronicles the political history of ESL and bilingual education in the United States, describes major program designs, and reviews literature on public opinion concerning these programs. The survey sought to determine what the general public believes to be the most appropriate methods of educating language-minority students and where they obtained information to form those judgments. Respondents were categorized according to their level of expertise in language pedagogy (expert/non-expert) and native language (English/non-English). Subjects were 97 graduate students in various fields, divided into four groups by expertise and native language status. All were administered a Likert-type questionnaire (appended) with 30 statements concerning program models and sources of information. Results indicate that overall, the respondents were not opposed to bilingual education, and almost universally agreed that bilingualism was a professional asset. However, they favored English language learning over native language maintenance, supporting the prediction that transitional programs would be favored. A majority did not get their information from the media, and a slight majority claimed their information came from research. Contains 26 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gwendolyn Williams

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

Department of Speech Communication

ED 409 721

Challenging the Political Mirage of ESL and Bilingual Education: A Study of Public Knowledge

A Paper in

English as a Second Language

by

Gwendolyn M. Williams

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Teaching English as a Second Language

March 1997

FL024652

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We approve the Master's paper of Gwendolyn M. Williams

Date of Signature

3/3/97

J. Marc Authier, Chair
Senior Lecturer of ESL and Linguistics

Date of Signature

2/26/97

Grant Henning
Professor of Speech Communication

Date of Signature

3/3/97

Patrick Shannon
Professor of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES iv

ABSTRACT v

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 1
- 2.1 History of Bilingual Education 1
- 2.2 Types of Bilingual Education Programs 8
- 2.3 Attitudes toward Bilingual Education Programs 10

III. THE STUDY 14
- 3.1 Purpose Statement 14
- 3.2 Research Questions 14
- 3.3 Null Hypothesis 14
- 3.4 Operational Definitions of Variables 14

IV. METHOD 15
- 4.1 Subjects 15
- 4.2 Instrumentation 15

V. ANALYSIS 16
- 5.1 Methods of Analysis 16
- 5.2 Research Hypothesis 16

VI. RESULTS 17
- 6.1 Interpretation of Statistics 26

VII. DISCUSSION 29
- 7.1 General Findings 29
- 7.2 Speculations about Group Differences 30
- 7.3 Limitations 31
- 7.4 Implications 32
- 7.5 Recommendations for Further Research 33

VIII. APPENDICES 35
- 8.1 Reference List 35
- 8.2 Questionnaire 37

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

Table 1: *Demographics of Sample*.....17

Table 2: *Means and Standard Deviations for all Groups*.....18

Table 3: *Chi Square Values for Tests of Independence of Agreement and Group Membership*.....19

Table 4: *t-test Values for Questions 31 and 32*.....30

ABSTRACT

This study seeks to survey the public knowledge of ESL and bilingual education. Set in the historical background of political vacillation, such a research project becomes increasingly important for both the instructors and students involved in such programs. If current attitudes predict the future policies of minority language education, the outlook for ESL and bilingual education programs looks rather bleak. To provide promise for tomorrow's minority students, researchers need to examine the public knowledge of ESL and bilingual education. If one is truly interested in procuring social change, the work must begin with the present knowledge of such programs. The concluding results will suggest some target areas for clearing away some misconceptions.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this research project is to pinpoint exactly what people believe to be true about the various teaching methods of ESL and bilingual education. All too often individuals base their knowledge of a concept on the reports in the media. ESL and bilingual education have been portrayed as ineffective because opponents argue that people do not learn English in these programs. However, their claims lack a solid foundation based on the research conducted in the field and in the classroom. Since the public has not sought the findings of research, researchers need to find out what people know about such programs in order to bridge the gap between the world of research and the realm of public information. To perform this task successfully, researchers must be properly armed with an understanding of the historical context of ESL and bilingual education, the various programs involved in ESL and bilingual education, and the current attitudes toward the education of minority language students.

Bilingual education has existed in the United States for many years. However, educating children who are not native speakers of English has especially attracted the attention of the federal government, which has been fickle in its attitude toward and funding of bilingual education. The attitudes toward bilingual education ultimately reflect the status of a minority language in a country (Williams & Snipper, 1990). However, historically, many different factors have influenced bilingual education. While ESL generally does not use bilingual instruction, it remains linked to bilingual education in that it too has been affected by political policymaking. Therefore, this program has suffered through the same battles as bilingual education.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

History of Bilingual Education in the United States

As one proceeds through the archives of American history, the historical facts clearly show the pendulum of favor swing towards and against bilingual education at the hands of federal politicians. Prior to the twentieth century, bilingualism and bilingual education were accepted facts of American life (Crawford, 1989). In the late 1800's bilingual instruction was widely available in the United States. In

fact, many incentives were provided for the people to learn English (Behuniak, Hubert, LaFontaine & Nearine, 1988). Learning English created a way to integrate into American society. This successful assimilation enabled non-native speakers to lead better lives. However, the immigrant's knowledge of English did not replace his native language; instead bilingualism remained widely accepted.

This positive attitude toward bilingualism and bilingual education disappeared with the onslaught of World War I. At this time the xenophobic Americans grew quite hostile towards non-English speakers by imposing laws to punish anyone who did not speak English (Behuniak, Hubert, LaFontaine & Nearine, 1988). In fact, schools were not encouraged to teach any kind of language except English. Some states, such as Nebraska, actually forbid foreign language instruction (Lessow-Hurley, 1990).

While the laws were repealed by judges who deemed the prohibition as unconstitutional, the antagonistic fervor continued until the siege of World War II. During the course of the war, America found limited value in bilingualism when they communicated with the other countries involved in the war (Lessow- Hurley, 1990). Suddenly the military prized the bilingual servicemen who could translate messages into other languages. For example, the American Marines who spoke Navaho were used to encode messages that could not be broken by the Japanese (Lessow-Hurley, 1990). Although the valuing of bilingualism slowly spread throughout the United States, it took many years to gain official favor in the form of federal legislation.

The National Defense Act of 1958, while primarily focusing on educating the servicemen who had fought during the war, also included a clause that supported foreign language instruction. The government started to support financially foreign language teaching through grants for second language materials (Crawford, 1989). Although this clause did not specifically endorse bilingual education, this funding paved the way for reemergence of bilingual education in the United States.

Shortly after the passage of this law, many Cuban refugees fled to Miami during the Cuban Revolution of 1959, which ultimately resulted in the formation of bilingual programs. The Cuban migrants initially formed private Spanish speaking schools with the hopes of returning to Cuba after the

political climate had mellowed. However, they soon realized that such an event was unlikely, so they pressured the city to provide bilingual classes for their children. Coral Way Elementary School launched a successful bilingual program and included trained Cuban teachers to maintain the Spanish language in the Cuban children (Ovando & Collier, 1985). While this model proved to be successful in producing bilingual students, few people took notice of this innovative accomplishment.

The passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 heightened people's awareness of minorities and minority education. However, no action was taken to support bilingual education until 1968 when the Bilingual Education Act mandated funding for bilingual education programs (Cohen, 1984). This law became part of Chapter VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In spite of funding, which served as an incentive to some school districts, the law did not require bilingual education. This decree targeted the impoverished students who could not speak English (Crawford, 1989). In the first year seventy-six programs were established to help the non-English speaking children (Lessow-Hurley, 1990). Congress had hoped to increase students' English skills as well as supporting their cultural heritage and language (Ovando & Collier, 1985). Although the lawmakers attempted to serve the needs of the large number of limited English proficient students, the legislation emerged as too general to be of much assistance to those students.

While the law tried to give support to minority students, it failed to address three critical issues (Behuniak, Hubert, LaFontaine & Nearine, 1988). First, the edict did not mention whether the native language should be used as a transition to English or maintained as a valued personal asset. This provision also failed to explain the specific context or time period in which the first language should be used in the classroom. Additionally, this measure did not delineate any criteria for the screening of participants. Without a rigid structure, each individual program developed different methodologies and goals while all programs received federal funding.

Since the Bilingual Education Act included no specific enforceable guidelines, people turned to the court system to receive the bilingual education program that their school district would not provide. Perhaps the most famous case of bilingual education is the Lau vs. Nichols ruling which was handed

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

down in 1974. The verdict stated that merely providing the same facilities and resources for the minority language students did not reflect equal treatment when the students were denied access to meaningful education because of their inability to understand the language (Lessow-Hurley, 1990). Therefore these limited English proficient students were entitled to special assistance which would give them the ability to participate equally in the schools (Crawford, 1992).

Even though this ruling and other court cases had given more structure to the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, this provision had to be renewed every couple of years. The first reauthorization of this statute, which occurred in 1974, stressed the goal of English mastery (Ovando & Collier, 1988). Although the law required schools to include first language instruction, this type of teaching remained in use only until the student could function effectively in the present educational structure. In addition, lawmakers deleted the poverty clause thus making funding available to more students of both the transitional and maintenance models (Crawford, 1989).

To further strengthen the rights of limited English proficient students, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 set regulations to be followed by each state. Included in the list of prohibitions was the clause that the state shall not deny equal access to anyone by neglecting to bridge language barriers that prohibit students from engaging in educational programs (Lessow-Hurley, 1990). This statement has served as the foundation of many subsequent court cases involving bilingual education. However, these isolated cases mandated bilingual education for specific locations in the country. Widespread enforcement of bilingual education did not occur until the following year.

The Secretary of Education, Terrell Bell, authored the Lau Remedies of 1975, which created stricter guidelines for bilingual education programs (Crawford, 1989). These specifications explained how to recognize and assess limited English proficient students. It also detailed suitable methodology for the various student proficiency levels. The plan also spelled out criteria for determining whether a student was ready to be mainstreamed into a regular English-speaking classroom. In addition to giving instructional standards, the statute provided professional qualifications for the teachers of these students. Bilingual education was mandated for the elementary students who had suffered from lack of

supplemental instruction. However, a dual language approach was not required for secondary students because they possessed a larger knowledge base in their native language which they could transfer to the second language (Crawford, 1989). This proposition was passed hastily, thereby making school districts subject to the components it contained. The Office of Civil Rights investigated the bilingual programs to search for violations of this law or of the student's rights. Failure to comply with the regulations resulted in loss of funding from the federal government (Crawford, 1989). As a result, most of the schools followed these guidelines.

While complying with the Lau Remedies appeared to be overwhelming to some school districts, the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs offered support to the states and school districts (Ovando & Collier, 1985). This support took the form of evaluation centers, material development centers and general bilingual education centers which were designed to assist the teacher with offering quality bilingual education to the students. However, these offices lacked a strong central backing at the national level, so the states could not provide the centers as effectively as a national network.

Although bilingual education was gaining popularity, it suffered a major setback at the publication of one national research study. In 1977, the American Institute for Research (AIR) conducted the first widespread comparison of bilingual education with submersion, an educational practice which consists of placing language minority students in a regular English speaking classroom without any form of language assistance (Crawford, 1989). Their findings revealed that bilingual education showed no significant advantage over placing the limited English proficient students in mainstream classes with their native speaker peers (Crawford, 1992). Proponents of bilingual education argued that the researchers used unspecified methodology to reach this conclusion.

Even though this study had received much criticism, the shadow of its conclusion still lingered over the process of renewing the Bilingual Education Act in 1978. As part of the act, evaluation of federally funded programs was required (Behuniak, Hubert, LaFontaine & Nearine, 1988). However, no effectiveness criteria had been developed, so this decree did not prove to be binding for the school

districts. Therefore, native language instruction was strictly limited to the transitional mode (Crawford, 1989). However, native English speakers were welcomed into the bilingual classroom as long as their numbers did not exceed forty percent of the class (Ovando & Collier, 1985). This political move integrated students to avoid segregation charges. Nonetheless, the stated goal of bilingual education remained to mainstream the limited English proficient students as soon as possible. With this change to the Act, the pendulum struck against the maintenance dual language instruction.

Perceiving a bleak future for bilingual education, President Carter signed an edict to encourage bilingual education shortly before he left office in 1980 (Crawford, 1989). These Lau Regulations required bilingual education programs in schools that contained twenty-five members of the same minority group. Although Carter took a staunch stand, Congress did not support his effort. Instead grants and enforcement of this policy were weakened from previous laws such as the Lau Remedies (Crawford, 1989). Ironically enough, Terrell Bell, the creator of the Lau Remedies, now denounced the Lau Regulations as being too rigid (Cohen 1984).

The stormy Reagan years left bilingual education battered and weak. President Reagan, a firm opponent of bilingual education, posed a serious threat to all types of bilingual education. During his first term Reagan slashed bilingual education funding by thirty-three million dollars (Cohen, 1984). After a lot of in-house bickering over bilingual education funding, Congress finally reached an agreement in 1984. According to this understanding, four percent of the Chapter VII funds were allocated to English-only methods of instruction with half of the surplus of the Chapter's funds also supporting these approaches (Crawford, 1989). In exchange for this shift of finances, the National Association of Bilingual Education gained programs for non-native speaking parents and special students, such as gifted, special education and preschool children. Additionally, this organization received a meager allocation to experiment with maintenance programs of bilingual education (Crawford, 1989).

While this compromise seemed to foretell tales of impending doom for bilingual education, later events sealed the fate of dual language instruction. The new Secretary of Education, William Bennett, had never stepped inside a bilingual classroom, yet he created the legislation that vanquished all hopes for

a brighter future in bilingual education (Crawford, 1989). In 1988, President Reagan signed another act that allocated seventy to seventy-five percent of the excess of Chapter VI funding to English-only methods. Furthermore, funds would also be taken from the teacher training account that was cut by twenty percent. In sum, eighteen million dollars was diverted from bilingual methods of instruction to English-only approaches (Crawford, 1989). While allowing future administrations to spend less than twenty-five percent on monolingual English Instruction, this law included a three year limit for native language before joining English-only instruction.

Although the chime for bilingual education has sounded, still the clock continues to tick. Impending education reform will undoubtedly influence the future of bilingual education. Although bilingual education has been lumped together with foreign language instruction, time will tell what this new association will yield (Edwards & McMillan, 1995).

While Congressional action proposes ESL funding, new research continues to advocate the effectiveness of bilingual education. According to a recent George Mason University study of forty-two thousand non-native speakers, these students scored higher than their earlier scores on the standardized English test after they had completed six years of bilingual education (Hornblower, 1995). In addition the Ramirez Report indicated that limited English proficient speakers can receive first language instruction without inhibiting their acquisition of English (Ramirez, 1991). These findings clearly contradict the 1988 assessments that students only need three years of bilingual education and that any first language instruction becomes detrimental to the acquisition of the second language.

Contrasting the present with the past offers a vivid view of how politics affect bilingual education. While politicians acted on behalf of some American people, they possessed a distorted idea of bilingual education. Cummins (1989) argues that the image took root in ignorance and naiveté. This misconception stems from ineffective bilingual programs that function on insufficient funding instead of the research that supports bilingual instruction. Therefore, the situation presents a cyclical problem in that programs cannot operate properly without adequate funding. However, the government refuses to fund programs that are ineffective.

While such a stalemate seems inconsequential to many Americans, this impasse affects many non-native speaking Americans. Of the forty-three million students that attend public school, almost three million are non-English speaking students (Hornblower, 1995). Even though this number may appear minor when compared to the whole population of students, these students are not equally distributed among the total number. In some school districts, non-native English speakers constitute twenty-five to sixty percent of the entire school population (Porter, 1990). Additionally, one in six public school teachers has a non-native speaker in his or her classroom (Porter, 1990). These statistics reinforce the call for bilingual education reform. Without political support and funding, these students are unlikely to succeed in the American school system. Therefore, after an examination of bilingual education within the context of American history, a person can see that enlightening the American public initiates the first step towards change.

Types of Bilingual Education Programs

Many of the perceptions about bilingual education in the United States today evolve from a confusion about the many different kinds of bilingual education. People do not realize that many varieties exist; and as a result, they discredit all of bilingual education programs upon hearing negative reports of one particular program. Therefore, it becomes necessary to distinguish between the many different approaches to educating minority language students.

A truly bilingual program uses at least two languages in the classroom. This realm may be broken down into several different subgroups. Originally, bilingual education was intended to merely act as a transition from immigrants' native culture to the target language and culture (Hancock & Katel, 1995). Current true transitional bilingual programs use both languages in classroom instruction. Transitional programs should be "weigh stations and not dumping spots" for students with a limited English proficiency (Hancock & Katel, 1995). Therefore the goal of transitional bilingual programs aims to mainstream non-English speaking students into a monolingual English classroom (Spener, 1988). In this type of program, speed takes top priority over the quality of academic learning. Most transitional curricula last for two or three years, thus being called the early exit program (Headden, 1995).

On the other hand, students remain in a maintenance bilingual program for three to six years. (Crawford, 1989). This type of program seeks to develop the student's first and second languages, thereby emphasizing the goal of becoming a truly bilingual individual (Scarcella, 1990). One of the underlying rationales to this extended program centers on the belief that older children and adults have a larger knowledge base that makes language learning more efficient by transferring conceptual knowledge from one language to the other (Scarcella, 1990). Studies have also shown that students who maintain their native culture and language will be more successful in school compared to the students who totally assimilate into American society (Nieto, 1992).

Another kind of enrichment program is the two-way bilingual program. This type brings together both native speakers and non-native speakers of English in the same classroom with the goal of promoting bilingualism for all students. Teachers deliver the instruction in two languages. Although most regular mainstream teachers support English speakers' development of a second language, they oppose the maintenance of the native tongue of the minority language speakers (Hakuta, 1992). Therefore this type of true bilingual education is not common. However, one example of this type of curriculum may be found in the Oyster Elementary School in Washington, D.C., where fifty-eight percent of the students are Hispanic, twenty-six percent are white, twelve percent of are African American and the remaining four percent are Asian (Hornblower, 1995). All these students receive bilingual instruction in English and Spanish.. Research has shown that the two-way bilingual education programs produce the highest academic achievers of all the bilingual programs (Hornblower, 1995).

A third type of bilingual instruction is the bilingual immersion program. This model puts a marked emphasis on instruction in English. However, the curriculum includes a four year intensive Spanish program to maintain the student's native language (Gersten & Woodward, 1995). This innovative method uses two languages, but a more definitive boundary exists between the two languages in that each language is used in separate classes. This unique model poses a balance between bilingual and monolingual approaches.

One model that is often confused with the bilingual immersion approach is submersion, which should not be labeled a bilingual approach at all (Scarcella, 1990). This type of program offers the minority language student no support as he or she is placed in regular English classes with his or her peers. This sink-or-swim method has not proven to be effective because the students often do not know enough English to participate in the English-speaking classroom. Therefore, the immersion approach pushes the student into the stream of the education without a paddle to steer through the rapids of English instruction.

Another type of program that mistakenly is categorized as bilingual education is English as a Second Language. This program differs from the bilingual approaches in that the instruction occurs in a simplified English to aid the comprehension of the students. ESL programs often take a whole language approach where they try to integrate English with the other academic subjects (Gersten & Woodward, 1995). I can cite a personal example in the John Harris Campus of the Harrisburg City School District in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. I did my undergraduate student teaching in this setting where the students received sheltered instruction in language arts, social studies, science, typing, and oral communications. The language arts and social studies curricula were the most extensive in that they had four levels of difficulty. While some students achieved the mainstreaming into general classes, the majority of the students remained in the sheltered classes until graduation when they received a high school diploma. At that time, the students would enroll in more English classes at the local community college to supplement their selected major. The goal of ESL classes focuses on the eventual mainstream of the student into classes of their native speaker counterparts. Therefore, ESL does not qualify as a bilingual program.

Attitudes toward Bilingual Education Programs

The great variety between these different programs may cause a great deal of confusion for the general public. Without a clear delineation of the distinguishing characteristics of each model, it would be quite easy to form quick incorrect judgments about bilingual education. While these opinions may seem innocuous enough, the attitudes play an important role in the political sphere because politicians must be reelected by their constituents. Therefore, politicians often follow the prevailing attitudes of the

moment. Despite the increasing research support for bilingual education, "the fate of bilingual education programs may depend more on the public's political opinions about them than on research evidence concerning their merits" (Huddy & Sears, 1990). From this standpoint the popular attitudes take on an added significance.

Many surveys of the American public reveal confusing results as many of the respondents hold erroneous stereotypes of bilingual education. In a 1984 poll of 1,570 non-Hispanic Americans, the majority of the sample could not provide an accurate description of any type of bilingual education program. Twenty-one percent of this sample equated bilingual education with foreign language instruction in general while eighteen percent matched it with bilingualism (Huddy, Sears & Cardoza, 1984). While both of these descriptions appear vague when compared with the actual characteristics of bilingual education programs, the attitudes toward bilingual education in general tend to be very well defined.

Media coverage, which sways some of the public opinion, portrays bilingual education as harmful to the American society as a whole. The critics that appear in the media take their position of opposition from the use of the native language in the classroom. These individuals focus on the melting pot ideal of assimilation and insist that students become Americanized by speaking only English (Schaefer, 1993). Implicitly such advocates insinuate that the native culture and language should be put away in a scrapbook because they interfere with the learning of English and becoming a loyal American (Hosch, 1984).

Contrary to the highly publicized opinion, several studies of the American public indicate that the majority of the people affirm bilingual education to varying extents (Huddy & Sears, 1990). Sixty-four percent of the American public surveyed in the Roper poll supported bilingual education (Donegan, 1996). While native language use in the maintenance model received slightly less favor, the public turned and gave full support to being a bilingual person. Therefore, the political viewpoint of a particular model shapes the opinions of the public.

Political views play a major role in determining attitudes toward bilingual education. Liberals, who often favor bilingualism, will tend to support a maintenance form of bilingual education (Hosch,

1984). On the other hand, more conservative people, while recognizing the injustice of placing limited English proficient students in the mainstream with American students, tend to advocate a transitional class where the native language serves as a means to the end of mainstreaming the students into an American classroom (Hosch, 1984). Studies strengthen the claim that political orientations have more effect on opinions than does personal experience. In a 1984 study, thirty-six percent of those surveyed listed political orientation as the basis for their opinions about bilingual education as compared with eight percent who cited personal experience factors (Huddy, Sears, & Cardoza, 1984).

Political opinions often are based on symbolic ideology rather than on practical tangible evidence. National bilingual education program implementation resulted from demands from minorities for equal access to education in the Lau vs. Nichols case in 1974 (Schaefer,1993). Therefore, many people align their views of bilingual education with their overall attitudes towards minorities and immigration. Attitudes against minorities develop from resentment of minorities' demands or special treatment, anti-immigration nationalism or partiality towards Hispanics (Huddy & Sears, 1990). Any one of these attitudes will likely form the core of an anti-bilingual education sentiment. Many people link affirmative action with bilingual education, so the recent attack on affirmative action could influence budget cuts on bilingual education (Huddy, Sears, & Cardoza, 1984). However, this association is not shared by every proponent of bilingual education. Brown (1993) emphatically states that bilingual education is not an offshoot of the civil rights movement.

While political perceptions can often be misleading, educating the general public may help eliminate the shrouded controversy surrounding bilingual education. However, many surveys show that education about the various types of bilingual education is not sufficient. Results indicate that the more informed people are the strongest opponents of bilingual education (Brown, 1993; Huddy & Sears, 1990). This would correlate with the growing antagonism towards the use of the native language in the classroom. Advocates then possess the job of informing the public of some of the sociological and political issues involved in bilingual education (Bermudez, 1984). Such concerns would include the levels of education in the native language that the students possess before entering a bilingual program. Perhaps the student really needs first language support if the level of prior education is not comparable to his or

her age grade level in the American system. Additionally, more emphasis should be placed on school regulation and evaluations to show successful students. One of the political aspects that the public does not notice centers on the amount of institutional support that a bilingual education program receives which varies from school to school (Bermudez, 1984). Unstable funding and institutional support hamper the effectiveness of such a program. Bilingual education suffers as being the most likely program to be affected by budget cuts (Huddy & Sears, 1990). Last summer alone, Congress cut 38.5 million dollars from a 195.2 million dollar bilingual education budget.

With wavering financial, political, and public support bilingual education programs of all types remain in jeopardy for the many non-native speakers who desperately need its services. Regardless of the form of bilingual education that one favors, having no choices would prevent non-native speakers from even having the option of becoming Americanized or bicultural. Therefore, public opinion about bilingual education not only affects the non-native speaker; it influences society as a whole by denying the newcomers the education needed to function in and contribute to our common society. From this standpoint bilingual education can be viewed as an investment in American society.

After considering the socio-historical context of this study, it would be best to refocus the attention on the present study. The benefits of such a study could lead to important breakthroughs in the war against uniformed public opinion. While we know the popular opinions on this topic, there has been little inquiry into the realm of what people actually know about this topic. If researchers could ascertain what people know, it would be easier to address the public from their viewpoint. Right now the battlefield between proponents of multilingual education and their adversaries remains clouded with the smokescreen of stereotypes. Each side has become so entangled in fighting the smoke that it has forgotten to investigate the reality that lies beyond. If a person examines the real knowledge that people possess, perhaps the war will not seem so futile. Perhaps some people are on the same side, but misinformation has driven them apart. Until researchers confront the knowledge behind the mirage of public perceptions, the proponents of ESL and bilingual education will not see the public support for their programs which remains crucial to the programs existence.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE STUDY

Purpose Statement

This study seeks to survey the public knowledge of ESL and bilingual education in order to combat the spread of misinformation that poses a serious threat to the future of such programs. If researchers can pinpoint the sources of the propaganda of bilingual education, then steps can be taken to inform the public about the true purpose and nature of bilingual education programs.

Research Questions

1. What do people who are language experts/non-experts and/or native speakers/non-native speakers judge to be the most appropriate ways of educating minority language students?
2. Where did people from these respective groups obtain their information to form such judgments?

Research Hypotheses

1. People will tend to favor transitional methods of bilingual education.
2. The general public feels that English mastery should be the goal of American bilingual education.
3. A majority of the people will indicate that their information has come from media sources

Null Hypotheses

1. There will be no preference for transitional methods over other methods of bilingual education
2. The opinion of agreement or disagreement about the appropriateness of methods of language instruction will be independent of group membership.
3. The sources of information about the appropriateness of methods of language instruction will be independent of group membership.

Operational Definitions of Variables

Independent Variables

- expertise- The expert participants had had formal instruction in language pedagogy at the graduate level. The non-experts had not had such instruction.
- nativeness- The native speaker participants were native speakers of English. Non-native speaker participants were native speakers of languages other than English.

Dependent Variables

- personal knowledge- This refers to the participants' beliefs about the appropriateness of pedagogical methods
- source of knowledge- The source identifies the self reported origin of participants' knowledge of the apppropriateness of pedagogical methods.

METHOD

Subjects

This study's sample consisted of one hundred subjects who are graduate students in various fields of study. The group was broken down into four equal groups of twenty-five each. The first group contained native speakers of English who had had instruction in language pedagogy. The next group consisted of non-native speakers who were learning English and had a background in language pedagogy. The third group was composed of native speakers who had had no instruction in language methodology. The last group was comprised of non-language experts who were non-native speakers of English.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire that was administered consisted of thirty statements that the participant rated according to the Likert scale (See Appendix B). The content of this collection of statements was divided equally between the models of maintenance, which emphasizes bilingualism, and transitional programs where the goal is to become fluent in English. This would include ESL methods. In addition, three

questions inquired about the sources of information on which the participant relies. To conclude the survey, five questions were included to ascertain some demographic information about the participant. The last nine questions were analyzed descriptively as well as statistically.

ANALYSIS

Methods of Analysis

The responses to the first thirty-three questions which use the Likert scale were analyzed using the Chi-square test.. The purpose of the comparison was to see if the group's membership was independent of self reported personal knowledge. Judgments can be made to see whether the group's mean fits in the distribution of means.

RESULTS

Although the method planned to have four groups of twenty-five each, the actual data collection deviated slightly from this plan. Table 1 illustrates the demographics for each of the four parts of the sample (See Table 1).

Table 1: Demographics of Sample

Trait	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Number of Subjects	24	21	26	26
Average Age	31.9583	29.6315	28.06	28.115
Average years of study at university	6.7083	6.238	6.3542	9.10416
Native Language	English-24	Chinese-6 Hungarian-1 Japanese- 2 Korean-4 Malay- 3 PNG Pidgin -1 Russian-1 Spanish-3	English-26	Chinese-19 French-1 Japanese-2 Korean-2 Turkish-2
Major	Comparative Literature-1 Computer Science-1 Education-3 French- 2 Spanish-2 Speech Communication-3 Teaching English as a 2nd Language-12	Bilingual Education-4 Comparative Literature-1 Computer Science-1 Teaching English as a 2nd Language-14	Acoustics-1 Biostatistics-1 Business Administration-1 Economics-3 Education-11 English-1 Health and Human Development-2 Kinesiology-1 Leisure Studies and Recreation-2 Speech Communication-3	Biology-2 Biochemistry-2 Chemical Engineering-1 Communications-1 Computer Science-1 Economics-1 Electrical Engineering-3 Education-2 Food Science-1 French-1 Genetics-1 Geoscience-1 Hotel and Restaurant Management- 2 Mathematics-2 Physics-2 Plant Pathology-2

This wide variety of languages and majors should provide a varied view of bilingual education. The subjects were selected from ESL graduate classes and graduate classes from various departments in which the researcher had contacts. The summary of the data revealed a wide variety in terms of the means of opinions expressed across groups. (See Table 2.) After examining the data using histograms, it was determined that the data were not normally distributed. Departure from normality was not corrected by any of several transformational procedures. Therefore a Chi square test was used to ascertain whether observed frequencies were dependent on group membership (See Table 3).

Table 2: Means and Standard Deviations for all Groups

	Native Speaker Expert			NonNative Speaker Expert			Native Speaker NonExpert			NonNative NonExpert		
Item	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
1	23	4.087	1.379	20	2.350	1.309	26	3.462	1.363	26	3.800	1.683
2	24	4.833	1.786	21	5.190	1.887	26	5.500	1.304	26	3.462	2.213
3	24	5.250	1.726	21	5.048	1.987	25	5.423	1.391	26	2.692	1.738
4	24	2.125	1.393	21	2.238	1.578	26	2.154	0.881	26	3.692	1.668
5	24	3.500	1.560	21	3.952	1.987	26	3.923	1.468	25	3.200	1.555
6	24	2.542	1.141	21	2.286	1.347	26	3.115	1.366	26	2.769	1.608
7	24	2.625	1.527	21	3.000	1.673	26	2.731	1.079	25	3.692	1.761
8	24	3.708	1.367	21	2.048	0.865	26	2.808	1.059	26	3.538	1.334
9	24	1.250	0.676	12	1.524	1.123	26	1.577	0.857	25	1.769	0.863
10	24	2.667	1.308	20	2.762	1.411	26	3.423	1.419	25	3.192	1.898
11	24	5.167	1.857	21	4.762	1.868	26	4.577	1.667	26	4.308	1.619
12	24	4.417	1.381	21	4.095	1.729	26	4.808	1.550	25	3.423	1.501
13	24	3.250	1.962	21	2.762	1.411	26	3.423	1.419	26	3.192	1.898
14	24	3.625	1.610	21	2.857	1.711	26	3.385	1.416	26	3.538	1.881
15	24	2.750	1.482	21	2.333	1.197	26	2.808	1.059	26	3.385	1.557
16	23	5.500	1.694	21	5.190	1.834	26	5.731	0.962	26	3.846	1.759
17	24	5.625	1.377	21	5.534	1.778	26	5.423	1.501	26	4.769	1.728
18	24	2.792	1.250	21	3.000	1.612	26	2.577	0.987	26	1.885	0.909
19	23	3.913	1.857	21	2.667	1.461	26	3.423	1.270	26	4.000	2.078
20	24	4.042	1.876	21	4.190	1.806	25	4.200	1.354	23	2.731	1.458
21	24	4.125	1.895	21	3.048	1.564	26	3.962	1.562	26	4.000	2.078
22	24	5.708	1.429	21	5.952	1.244	26	5.346	1.325	26	3.885	1.885
23	24	5.333	1.551	21	4.810	2.812	26	5.346	1.129	25	2.960	1.791
24	23	3.750	1.894	21	3.905	1.609	26	4.346	1.413	26	2.462	1.303
25	24	3.625	1.907	21	3.762	1.513	25	4.000	2.000	26	4.538	1.726
26	24	2.197	1.530	21	2.000	1.265	24	2.385	1.098	26	3.269	1.823
27	24	4.875	1.569	21	4.333	1.317	26	4.538	1.529	26	4.577	1.880
28	24	2.833	1.579	21	2.238	1.044	24	2.667	1.373	26	1.654	0.977
29	24	3.167	1.404	21	2.667	1.623	24	3.208	1.318	26	2.731	1.538
30	24	5.942	1.459	21	4.952	1.910	23	5.083	0.776	26	3.500	1.965
31	22	4.197	1.717	21	4.381	1.658	26	5.333	1.204	24	4.600	1.683
32	24	3.208	1.382	21	2.714	1.521	24	4.292	1.429	25	4.560	1.805
33	24	2.750	1.294	19	3.000	1.257	24	3.375	1.096	25	3.750	1.189

Table 3:Chi Square Values for Tests of Independence of Agreement and Group Membership

1.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	8	16	12	13
No Opinion	8	2	8	5
Disagree	7	2	6	8

$x^2 = 10.5213$

2.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	6	5	3	17
No Opinion	1	0	0	0
Disagree	17	16	22	9

$x^2 = 20.8309^{**}$

3.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	6	5	4	19
No Opinion	0	0	1	2
Disagree	18	16	20	5

$x^2 = 28.2103^{**}$

4.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	22	16	24	15
No Opinion	1	3	2	4
Disagree	1	2	0	7

$x^2 = 15.2167^{*}$

Table 3 (Continued)

5.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	15	11	13	14
No Opinion	2	2	2	8
Disagree	7	8	11	3

x^2=11.892

6.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	22	20	18	22
No Opinion	2	0	2	0
Disagree	2	1	6	4

x^2= 8.2788

7.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	20	15	22	12
No Opinion	2	2	2	4
Disagree	2	4	6	9

x^2= 11.4673

8.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	10	20	19	11
No Opinion	7	1	6	9
Disagree	7	0	1	6

x^2= 22.2956*

Table 3 (Continued)

9

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	23	20	25	24
No Opinion	1	0	1	1
Disagree	0	1	0	0

x^2= 4.4167

10.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	20	14	12	20
No Opinion	1	5	11	3
Disagree	3	2	3	2

x^2=13.45*

11.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	5	5	6	4
No Opinion	2	5	5	11
Disagree	17	11	14	11

x^2=8.7127

Table 3 (Continued)

12.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	5	8	5	19
No Opinion	7	4	5	2
Disagree	12	11	15	4

x^2= 22.769**

13.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	14	16	14	15
No Opinion	4	1	5	3
Disagree	6	4	7	8

x^2=3.8161

14.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	14	13	18	16
No Opinion	1	3	1	3
Disagree	9	5	7	7

x^2=3.4952

Table 3 (Continued)

15.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	18	18	21	12
No Opinion	4	2	3	6
Disagree	3	1	2	8

x^2= 12.1710

16.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	3	3	1	10
No Opinion	2	3	1	9
Disagree	19	15	24	7

x^2=28.3029**

17.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	1	3	3	4
No Opinion	6	2	3	9
Disagree	17	16	20	13

x^2=8.3906

18.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	17	16	25	26
No Opinion	4	3	0	0
Disagree	3	2	1	0

x^2=13.7054*

Table 3 (Continued)

19.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	11	16	18	14
No Opinion	2	2	3	1
Disagree	10	3	5	11

x^2=8.3262

20.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	12	9	11	20
No Opinion	1	2	0	1
Disagree	11	10	14	2

x^2=15.5816*

21.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	10	13	11	8
No Opinion	2	3	6	5
Disagree	12	5	9	13

x^2=7.237

22.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	2	1	4	12
No Opinion	3	2	3	4
Disagree	19	18	19	10

x^2=18.6952**

Table 3 (Continued)

23.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	4	6	2	18
No Opinion	1	1	2	2
Disagree	19	14	22	5

x^2=30.4181**

24.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	13	10	11	23
No Opinion	2	3	2	3
Disagree	8	8	13	0

x^2=17.9018**

25.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	15	10	11	5
No Opinion	0	7	1	4
Disagree	9	4	13	17

x^2=23.7386**

26.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	18	19	23	15
No Opinion	2	0	2	5
Disagree	4	2	1	6

x^2=11.0313

Table 3 (Continued)

27.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	3	6	6	8
No Opinion	5	6	5	2
Disagree	16	9	12	16

x^2=6.1943

28.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	20	18	22	25
No Opinion	0	3	0	1
Disagree	4	0	2	0

x^2=14.5634*

29.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	18	17	17	20
No Opinion	1	1	3	2
Disagree	5	3	4	4

x^2=1.8887

30.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	4	5	0	14
No Opinion	3	1	6	6
Disagree	17	15	17	6

x^2=26.9461**

Table 3 (Continued)

31.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	7	7	2	6
No Opinion	2	4	4	7
Disagree	15	10	18	11

x^2=8.7155

32.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	17	16	8	5
No Opinion	4	2	6	7
Disagree	3	3	10	13

x^2=22.3913**

33.

Responses	Native Speaker Expert	NonNative Speaker Expert	Native Speaker NonExpert	NonNative Speaker NonExpert
Agree	17	8	9	5
No Opinion	6	11	14	17
Disagree	1	0	1	3

x^2=15.2704*

*p<0.05 **p<0.01

Interpretation of Statistics

The items that showed significant group dependencies must be studied closely because it is not safe to say that the difference in agreement can always be attributed to the same group. Therefore, as a person looks at item 2 in *Table 3* it can be seen that the discrepant group is the non-native speaker non-experts, as seventeen of the subjects agreed with the statement compared to six, five and three members of

the other groups. This group felt that the use of two languages in the classroom distracted the student from learning English because the student would revert to the native language without becoming proficient in English. Once again in question 3 the non-native speaker non-expert group differed greatly from the other groups in the amount of assenting responses. These subjects believed that placing students in a regular English classroom without any supplemental language support would help the student acquire English more quickly. In statement 4, the degree of difference was slightly less because both of the non-native speaker groups varied from their native speaker counterparts, but were somewhat comparable to each other. Neither of these two non-native groups considered the use of the native language and culture in the classroom to add to the student's self esteem. The eighth question showed a large variance because two groups, the native speaker expert and the non-native speaker non-expert contrasted with the other groups. This similarity was surprising because it occurred with regards to two different groups with few common characteristics. Both groups did not give much support to the assertion that bilingual education provides an adequate foundation to succeed in a regular English classroom. In item 10, the chi square value was significant but only at the $p< 0.05$ level because eleven of the twenty-six native speaker non-expert expressed no preference. However, the number of dissenting responses remained uniform across all four groups. Therefore this group may have had little knowledge of ESL programs. Statement 12 revealed a highly significant chi square value because the non-native speaker non-expert sample contained a large number of affirming replies, which in actuality exceeded the total number of assenting responses for the other three groups. The non-native non-experts felt that one period of bilingual instruction was adequate to help them succeed in totally monolingual English classes. Similarly in question 16, the non-native speaker non-expert group had a greater number of concurring responses than the other groups. Most of these people supported or did not oppose English-only techniques as being the most appropriate method due to financial constraints. The difference in item 18 was that a large difference occurred between the expert groups and the non-expert groups. The non-expert groups overwhelmingly agreed that minority students should be mainstreamed into regular English classes so that they could learn English from their native speaking peers. However the difference in statement 20 remained limited to the non-native speaker non-expert group in that the other three groups

had similar values. This group gave great credence to the importance of English mastery over native language maintenance. Likewise, question 22 had a much greater number of agreeing responses in the non-native speaker non-expert group than the other sections. This group again advocated that only English should be used in the classroom, this time because of the abundance of monolingual instructors. The next response pattern (23) revealed similar results in that a disproportionate number of the non-native speaker non-expert group supported the statement presented in that the respondents believed that dual language instruction would hamper the student's ability to learn English. In item 24, the same pattern occurred in the non-native speaker non-expert section. These people saw English as the only solution for a class of students with various language backgrounds. However, question 25 became significant as a result of a large number of no opinions for the non-native speaker expert group and the great number of dissenting opinions in the non-native speaker non-expert group. Therefore, the reaction to the claim that the lack of bilingual classes reflects an attitude of assimilation was quite mixed. In item 28, the chi square value was slightly significant because of the number of disagreeing native speaker experts when compared with the other three sections. Additionally, several of the non-native experts expressed no opinion for this statement. Thus, not all of the subjects concurred that immigrants should learn English if they want to live in America. Again in response to item thirty, the non-native speaker non-expert subjects had more affirming selections than the other three groups, who maintained their support for the monolingual English classroom. However, in question 32, the non-native speaker non-expert group contained fewer affirmative responses than the other groups. This group stated that they did not base their opinions on research reports. The last item (33) was slightly significant because of the large number of agreeing responses from the native speaker expert group. The other three groups had large numbers in the no opinion category. The majority of this native speaker expert group stated that their experience with minority education was positive.

The statements were mixed as far as their positive and negative wording, therefore it is not possible to do a straight comparison between different items. However, a matched group t-test was performed on items 31 and 32 to determine which source the respondents got their information from more frequently.

Table 4: t-test Values for Questions 31 and 32

Groups	Number of Respondents	Item 31 Mean	Item 31 St. Dev.	Item 32 Mean	Item 32 St. Dev.	t value
Native Speaker Experts	24	4.197	1.717	3.208	1.382	3.85**
NonNative Speaker Experts	21	4.381	1.658	2.714	1.521	3.97**
Native Speaker NonExperts	24	5.333	1.204	4.292	1.429	2.47*
NonNative Speaker NonExperts	25	4.600	1.683	4.560	1.805	0.21

*p<.05 **p<.01

While not all of the subjects answered these two questions, the results of the given answers show that the two expert groups relied on the media instead of basing their opinions on research reports conducted in the field of minority language education. Surprisingly the native speaker non-expert group did not get their information from the media as much as was predicted. It should be noted that the reports in the media and findings in the realm of research are not necessarily diametrically opposed to each other. However, the media tends to support assimilation and English mastery (Schaefer, 1993). That is, quite often the coverage in the news seems to focus on the unsuccessful programs to illustrate their ineffectiveness to teach the students English (Hancock & Katel, 1995)

DISCUSSION

General Findings

The original research questions were "What do people who are language experts/ non-experts and/or native speakers/non-native speakers judge to be the most appropriate ways of educating minority language students?" and "Where did people from these respective groups obtain their information to form such judgments?" Overall the findings show that people are not opposed to bilingual education, which

confirms earlier studies (Huddy & Sears, 1990). The overwhelming majority (96 percent of the sample) agreed that bilingualism was a professional asset. However, English proficiency became more important than maintaining the native language. Therefore, the research hypotheses that subjects would favor English mastery through transitional forms of bilingual education has been confirmed by this study.

The last hypothesis was negated in that the majority (58 percent) of the respondents indicated that they did not get their information from the media. A slight majority agreed with the assertion that they received their information from research conducted in the field of minority language education. However, these self reported responses could be slightly misleading in that media coverage is typically portrayed negatively, so the subjects may not have given their actual source as the media for this reason. The identification of research in the field as the information source maintained a slim margin in that the supportive votes totalled only one more response than the combined score of opposition and no opinion.

Although Crawford (1989) argues that historically, political support for bilingual education and ESL programs has been dependent on the financial support that they receive, this study did not reveal that money played a primary role in the people's support for bilingual education. A majority of 68 percent of the sample responded that English only methods should not receive more federal funding. Additionally, 67 percent of the subjects responded that American taxpayers should pay for instruction in the student's native language. This support for national funding was not anticipated.

However, the fact that the sentiment that immigrants should learn English if they want to live in America received a larger amount of endorsement than had been expected. An overwhelming 94 percent of the total sample agreed with this statement. Even the non-native speakers affirmed this opinion with 91 percent of this subgroup so responding, which includes experts and non-experts.

The ESL model gained majority support as 69 percent of the subjects indicated that the sheltered English approach helps the student to learn English as he or she studies the conceptual content. However, the question was not worded to assess the opinion toward ESL therefore it cannot be generalized to say that ESL is the most acceptable method. Still, given that the respondents gave a priority to English mastery, support for ESL would be expected.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Speculations about Differences between Groups

Each question possessed unique differences that could not always be attributed to one single group. Quite often the non-native speaker non-expert was less favorable towards the use of two languages in the classroom. This may have resulted from their own experience of learning English in that they found a monolingual English classroom which forced them to use English as the quickest way to learn English. Probably these individuals are generally unfamiliar with research in the field that supports the use of two languages in the classroom so that the student may become a truly bilingual individual (Scarcella, 1990). Additionally, neither of the non-native speaker groups enthusiastically supported the use of the first language or culture as a means of improving the self worth of the students, which could signify that these non-native speakers prefer to reaffirm their cultural identities in other forums outside of the classroom, such as community organizations or churches. Perhaps these non-experts feel that they need to assimilate into the native speaker classroom in order to receive a quality education here in the United States.

The non-native expert group differed slightly from their novice counterpart in that while the non-expert group quite often took a definite stand of agreement or disagreement, this group preferred to take a more neutral stance. For example, item 10 stated that a sheltered English class helped the students to acquire concepts while they were learning English. While the native speaker experts enthusiastically supported this claim, the non-native experts were halfhearted in their agreement with this statement. Occasionally the non-native experts differed from the native speaking experts. For example, while only 10 native speaker experts felt that bilingual instruction provided the minority language students with adequate background to succeed in the monolingual English classroom, 20 of the non-native speaker experts were more optimistic in supporting this assertion. The non-native experts possessed the knowledge of experts, but their responses were tempered by the fact that they had the experience of learning English, which was not necessarily in a bilingual classroom. Therefore, their personal experience probably impacted their opinions about bilingual education and ESL.

On the other hand, the native speaker experts may have possessed the theoretical knowledge without the practical experience. Basing opinions on theory may lead to overly optimistic results.

However, these native speakers tended to be realistic in their viewpoints in that most of the responses were consistent with the non-native speaker experts. The responses to item 25 illustrated the native speaker's unromanticized view of America in that 63 percent of this group expressed the opinion that the lack of bilingual classes shows that Americans do not value the first language and culture. Although they had some negative ideas concerning bilingual education programs, the majority of the native speaker experts responded that their experience with minority language education had been positive. However, this may be due to the fact that the native speakers have often assumed the role of the teacher, which would give quite a different viewpoint from that of a student in one of these programs.

The group of native speaker non-experts often had responses that were similar to the other groups except the native speaker experts. However, occasionally the native speaker non-expert group had a varying number of positive responses. For example, only one person disagreed with the statement in question 26 that classes that use the first language and culture of the minority language student are beneficial to our society. The other groups contained more dissenters. This may be a provincial viewpoint that failed to consider all of the political ramifications of including the first language and culture in the classroom. However, this group remained consistent in their support of dual language usage in the classroom because not one of them affirmed the belief that a monolingual English classroom would be less confusing than switching between two languages. This remained in stark contrast to all of the other groups which gave varied support to this item (30). The native speaker non-expert group provided another divergence from the other groups in question 31. While the expected result would be that the non-experts would rely more heavily on the media, the overwhelming majority of this group said that they did not base their beliefs of the coverage in the media. Therefore, each group possessed some varying opinions even though a lot of similarities could be seen throughout the data.

Limitations

Although this study encompassed a wide variety of people from different cultural and academic backgrounds, the results of this study cannot be overgeneralized for several different reasons. First of all, the subjects of this study lived in the culturally diverse environment of a university. Perhaps more

homogenous populations would exhibit different opinions. The questionnaire might have been an inadequate measure of some of the opinions because several of the respondents wrote additional comments on the questionnaire such as "it depends". Therefore, this study may have been more valid if the questionnaire had been constructed differently. Additionally, the non-native speaker non-expert population came from ESL classes and perhaps they should have been divided evenly between people in ESL classes and individuals who were not enrolled in such classes in order to get a more balanced opinion from this group. The total sample was only a small representation from one locale in the nation and perhaps students studying at other locations would possess very different beliefs.

Implications

People seemed to generally support bilingual programs, but the majority of respondents had no experience with these types of programs so their opinions were not based on real experiences. ESL programs and bilingual programs need to become more visible to the community around them. Perhaps some positive self-generated publicity would catch the attention of the media, which would reach a large number of people. The average community member may not know that such programs exist in the community, therefore ESL programs and bilingual education would not affect them. However, if such programs were to become an important part of the neighborhood, more political action would be taken to protect such programs. Seeing a successful program in action would be the best advertisement to the community. Therefore, directors of ESL and bilingual programs need to reach out into the surrounding environment in order to gain a voice in the world around them. Many community projects could be undertaken as a project to help the non-native speakers learn English and gain recognition form the community members. Additionally, ESL and bilingual program students need to interact with the community members so that ESL an bilingual education programs are no longer abstract concepts, instead they become a face with a name. Until people in these programs are recognized as people who can be an asset to the nation, ESL and bilingual education programs remain at risk.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study did not fully explore the sources of information on which the subjects based their opinions. Therefore, more research needs to investigate these and perhaps a qualitative study would be the best way to do so. If the subjects could describe their information source on an individual basis, then perhaps the spread of misinformation could be contained if researchers could ascertain which specific sources are used most heavily.

Perhaps another important study would be to survey politicians at a local, state, and national level to determine their beliefs about ESL and bilingual education. This study could prove to be valuable for trying to predict the future political support of these programs. However, such a study may not maintain its validity for a long time because politicians change frequently. The legacy of prevailing attitudes may remain somewhat stable over time, but a person cannot assume that this would occur.

An informative study could be done to ascertain what contact the general public has had with ESL and bilingual programs. Probably most of the general population has not had experiences with ESL or bilingual education programs. If researchers could find what the negative parts of their experience were, then perhaps these results could be used to improve existing programs for minority language students. Additionally, the perceptions of the experiences would be informative as to determining the status of intercultural relations within the community.

Future research could supplement the present study by providing a broader picture of the reality behind the existing clouds of misperceptions that both the advocates and general public possess. Until both sides see the current attitudes toward and conditions of ESL and bilingual programs, the future of these programs remains uncertain. Therefore, researchers and instructors alike must continue to challenge the current political mirage to ensure a brighter future for America's minority language students.

APPENDIX A

Reference List

Behuniak, P., Hubert, J., LaFontaine, H. & Nearine, R. (1988). Bilingual education: Evaluation politics and practices. Evaluation Review, 12, 463-507.

Bermudez, A. (1984). Generating public awareness of bilingual education in the United States: Part I programmatic variables. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED255032.

Brown, B. (1993). Issues in conducting surveys regarding public opinion toward bilingual education. ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED359770.

Cohen, G. (1984). The politics of bilingual education Oxford Review of Education, 10, 225-241.

Crawford, J. (1989). Bilingual education: History, politics, theory and practice. Trenton: Crane.

Crawford, J. (1992). Hold your tongue: Bilingualism and the politics of English only. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Cummins, J. (1989). Empowering minority students. Sacramento: California Association of Bilingual Education.

Donegan, C. (1996, January 19). Debate over bilingualism: The issues. CQ Researcher, 51-68.

Edwards, J.D. & McMillan, C. (1995). More is not enough: ESL and education reform in the U.S. TESOL Matters, 1: 5 .

Gersten, R. & Woodward, J. (1995). A longitudinal study of transitional and immersion bilingual education programs in one district. Elementary School Journal,95, (3), 223-229.

Hakuta, K. (1992). Do bilingual education programs help Hispanic children learn English and assimilate into American culture. CQ Researcher, 2, 946.

Hancock, L. and Katel, P. (1995, October 2). The bilingual bog. Newsweek,126, 89.

Headden, S. (1995, September 25). Tongue tied in the schools. U.S. News & World Report, 119, 44-47.

Hornblower, M. (1995, October 9). Tongues in check. Time, 146, 41-50.

Hosch, H. (1984). Attitudes toward bilingual education: A view from the border. Studies in Language and Linguistics. El Paso: Texas Western Press.

Huddy, L. & Sears, D. (1990, March). Qualified public support for bilingual education: Some policy implications. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 508, 118-134.

Huddy, L., Sears, D. & Cardoza, D. (1994). Public attitudes toward bilingual education. ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED252054.

Lessow-Hurley, J. (1990). The foundations of dual language instruction. New York: Longman.

Nieto, S. (1992). We speak many tongues: Language diversity and multicultural education. In C. Diaz (Ed). Multicultural education for the 21st century. (pp. 112-136). Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Ovando, C.J. & Collier, V.P. (1985). Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Porter, R.P. (1990). Forked tongue: The politics of bilingual education. New York: Basic.

Ramirez, J.D. (1991). Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early exit and late exit bilingual education programs. United States Department of Education.

Scarcella, R. (1990). Teaching language minority students in the multicultural classroom. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Regents.

Schaefer, R. (1993). Racial and ethnic groups. New York: Harper and Collins College Publishers.

Spener, D. (1988). Transitional bilingual education and the socialization of immigrants. Harvard Education Review, 58, (2), 133-151.

Williams, J.D. & Snipper, G.C. (1990). Literacy and bilingualism. New York: Longman.

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire

Please circle the number which most closely matches your opinions about the following statements

Very strongly Agree 1	**Strongly Agree 2**	**Slightly Agree 3**	**No Opinion 4**	**Slightly Disagree 5**	**Strongly Disagree 6**	**Very Strongly Disagree 7**

1.	Bilingual aides provide adequate support to help a non-native speaking student participate in an English speaking classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	Instruction in two languages will result in a poor level of English proficiency because the student will use his or her native language in the classroom instead of speaking English.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	Providing no language support for minority language students in regular English classes will help the students learn English more quickly than methods that use two languages in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	Using the first language and culture as an important part of the second language classroom gives the student a greater sense of self worth.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	The goal of education for minority language students should be to become part of an English speaking classroom as quickly as possible.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	Combining students with two different language backgrounds in one class would help students learn from each other as native speaker models.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	Using two languages in the classroom helps the students to communicate while they are learning English.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. Bilingual instruction gives the students adequate preparation to help them succeed in the monolingual English classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Becoming a truly bilingual individual would be a great asset for employment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Using simplified English for content area instruction helps the student to learn English along with the conceptual knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. American taxpayers should not be required to pay for the instruction in the minority students' first language.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. A minority language student can successfully participate in regular English classes with one period of bilingual tutorial to explain the concepts learned in the English classes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Instruction in the minority language students' first language should be continued through high school in order to create truly bilingual individuals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Failure to use the students' native language and culture in the classroom will result in a loss of personal identity for the students.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. The use of the students' native language in the classroom allows students to base their learning of English on the conceptual knowledge they possess in the first language.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. English only techniques provide the most acceptable forms of minority language student education because they cost the least amount of money.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Programs that use only English as the language of instruction should receive more government funding than those programs that use two languages.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Minority language students should be mixed into the regular English classes so that they can learn English from the other students.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

19. Continuing to use the native language in the classroom will help students to communicate with family members that do not speak English.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Minority language students need to learn English to participate in American society, therefore mastery of English should be more important than keeping fluency in the native language.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Failing to keep the fluency in the native language for an extended period of time can leave the student helpless because he or she will not be able to communicate in English or the native language.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Monolingual English teachers are more common than bilingual teachers, therefore, only English should be used in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Using the native language in the classroom will have a negative effect on the students' ability to learn English.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Using English as the language of instruction is the only choice when there are several different languages represented.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. The lack of two language classrooms shows that Americans think that minorities should forget their native culture and become American.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Classes that use the native language and culture are beneficial to our multicultural American society.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Programs that use two languages for only a year or two produce bilingual students who are fluent in both languages.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Immigrants should learn English if they want to live in America.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Learning about a culture's food and holidays is a proper way to include culture in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

30. Using only English in the classroom would be less confusing for minority language students because they can learn in one language instead of switching between the two.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. I base my opinions about minority language education on reports in the media.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. I base my opinions on research reports in the field of minority language student education programs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. My experience with minority language student education has been positive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. I have had training in teaching minority language students.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

35. I am currently studying a foreign language. YES NO

36. My native language is _____.

37. Age _____

38. I have studied _____ years at a college or university. (Please include undergraduate work.)

39. Major _____.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study!
Please return as soon as possible.